

Creation Versus Evolution

Post Reply Post Reply Page

3

<12345>

Author Message Topic Rating Rate Topic Topic Search Topic Search Topic Options
Topic Options

Israfil View Drop Down

Senior Member

Senior Member

Avatar

Joined: 08 September 2003

Status: Offline

Points: 3984 Post Options Post Options

Thanks (0) Thanks(0) Quote Israfil Quote Post ReplyReplyDirect Link To This Post
Posted: 27 July 2007 at 8:42pm

Rami,

Allow me to give you the respect you deserve by offering you a detailed answer and, if you are willing, bare with me because I did a 12 hour shift and am quite tired.

Rami your comments are in Red

assalamu alaikum

Israfil

Do you agree Evolution is a scientific process?

Bismi'llah ir-Rahmaan ir-Raheem

Wa'Alaikum Salaam

First, this question is slightly misleading. Let us be clear and not confuse between what is scientific and what is natural. Evolution is a natural process which scientific observation defines through empirical study.

Do you agree Science can only prove what it can observe?

Again, this question may be misleading as you state science can "only" prove observable things. Although I'm inclined to agree that science can prove observable facts I would have to add that science can, in addition to proof, come up with logical and theoretical propositions that are true.

Do you agree that for an animal to change from one form to another its DNA must change?

Agreed.

Can you show me where scientists have explicitly observed this process of DNA changing or rather new genetic information being added to DNA in order for the creature to grow in a specified manner according to its DNA like the laws of genetics state all creatures do, and not simply arrived at the phenomenon of evolution by conclusion.

You have to understand that evolutionary thought has existed for centuries starting with the Greek Philosophers (and Roman thinkers) to Arab biologist such as Al-Jahiz. What gave evolution its strong support was the prediction of genetic mutation (See: Gregor Mendel) which lead to further studies (and further splits in Mendelian and Darwinist evolutionary thought) to the eventual reconciliation of evolution and natural selection which in themselves lead to the construct of modern evolutionary synthesis.

Evolution has been observable through artificial selection, the intentional selection of traits in a population of organisms. I mean, we can see evolution ourselves by simply breeding a Rotweiler and Great Dane. This process has been done by humans for centuries as well. As far as physical observation of evolution the following pictures are a few examples provided by Wikipedia of evolution:

Geographical isolation of finches on the Galapagos Islands produced over a dozen new species.

Geographical isolation of finches on the Galapagos Islands produced over a dozen new species.

Simulation of genetic drift of 20 unlinked alleles in populations of 10 top and 100 bottom. Drift is more rapid in the smaller population.

Simulation of genetic drift of 20 unlinked alleles in populations of 10 (top) and 100 (bottom). Drift is more rapid in the smaller population.

The above (Genetic Drift) explains more on natural selection:

Genetic drift

For more details on this topic, see Genetic drift and Effective population size.

Genetic drift is the change in allele frequency from one generation to the next that occurs because alleles in the offspring generation are a random sample of those in the parent generation, and are thus subject to sampling error.[14] As a result, when selective forces are absent or relatively weak, allele frequencies tend to "drift" upward or downward in a random walk. This drift halts when an allele eventually becomes fixed, either by disappearing from the population, or replacing the other alleles entirely. Genetic drift may therefore eliminate some alleles from a population due to chance alone, and two separate populations that began with the same genetic structure can drift apart by random fluctuation into two divergent populations with different sets of alleles.[52] The time for an allele to become fixed by genetic drift depends on population size, with fixation occurring more rapidly in smaller populations.[53]

Although natural selection is responsible for adaptation, the relative importance of the two forces of natural selection and genetic drift in driving evolutionary change in general is an area of current research in evolutionary biology.[54] These investigations were prompted by the neutral theory of molecular evolution, which proposed that most evolutionary changes are the result the fixation of neutral mutations that do not have any immediate effects on the fitness of an organism.[55] Hence, in this model, most genetic changes in a population are the result of constant mutation pressure and genetic drift.[56] <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Evolution>

So yes, evolution had been observed by scientist and is an observable phenomenon.

This is akin to saying philosophy should not be taught, rather you mean philosophy should not be taught as a science.

I mistakenly said "Philosophy" when I should have said theology.

La illaha illa Allah is not a private belief and should be spread.

"There is no compulsion in religion" saying "There is no god but Allah" is a spiritual claim and must be proven. Since, no religionist ever has proven that God is physically comprehensible (which would be an inherent contradiction to the nature of God) it reduces itself, therefore, into a faith based claim and such claims should remain in private. I'm not gonna contradict myself here and say there is no evidence that a supreme deity does not exist-I'm merely one who believes in divine emanation.

This is a conclusion based on probability not scientific or observable facts that the two came from each other.

Brother, I wish you knew more about biochemistry.

You should know (as you probably do because of Qur'an) that all of life descend from one common ancestor from one gene pool. The evidence for common descent has come from the study of biochemical similarities between organisms. All cells use nucleic acid (complex high-molecular-weight biochemical macromolecule composed of nucleotide chains that convey genetic information) and amino acids. The record of evolution has been left in genomes which gave us a clue on when species diverged, produced by mutations. Because of the molecular clock, these DNA sequences have shed light on the close genetic similarity between humans and chimpanzees and their common ancestor.

a conclusion not an observable or provable fact.

No, a fact. All life came from water and genetic mutation of organisms started in water. Even the Qur'an says so:

We made from water every living thing. Will they not then believe? (The Noble Quran, 21:30)

They continually disregard what they can not see with there eyes, this is the state of kufr and what all people in the past asked there prophets "show us a miracle so we can believe".

This is not proper science. Scientist, like Theologians, have no place in fields they do not intensley study. I remember an old microbiology professor I had in college who said: "Even though life is phenomenal, we will not discuss its mystique in relation to spirituality as science can neither prove nor disprove its existence."

Many Islamic theologians where qualified scientist at the same time but by todays standards people only specialize in one field.

It wasnt that long ago that architects where also civil engineers only recently have the two disciplines been separate.

Agreed.

Who said it is the place of religion to clarify why bottles float, Islams so called golden age was primarily in scientific endeavor a golden age stemmed from religious practice, the two are not in competition with each other. the place of science is for practical purposes only a lowly place in the grander scheme of things, its value to humans today only comes due to the increasing materialism of societies.

This is purely subjective, which, rightfully so. Although Islam (I refer to Islam here in the historical sense not the religious sense) was quite successful with Philosophy and Science during the pre and post era of the Middle Ages, its hold on science can only be viewed past tense now. Because of the scientist in the European countries dared to challenge unpopular thought only then when the advancements of science grew into what it is today. Yes many Arab biologist and mathmeticians laid the foundations of some scientific thought and mathematics, there have been improvments and changes which tells me that going back to the early thinkers their thoughts nowadays would not be sufficient in it of themselves. This is why we have improvements on theory. I don't think its the increase of materialism as the reason why science has gained popularity, it is the willingness to uncover truth in the midst of a conservative society.

what fool would ask a physicist about chemistry and expect a correct answer?

You would be surprised.

Observable facts without the fairytale conclusions that come along with them.

Agreed.

he is asking us to use all our faculties not simply one or two i.e see and touch, use all of them to come up with a holistic picture not a half truth.

Agreed.

[Back to Top](#)

[Sponsored Links](#)

[Back to Top](#)

[rami View Drop Down](#)

Moderator Group

Moderator Group

Avatar

Male

Joined: 01 March 2000

Status: Offline

Points: 2549

[Post Options](#) [Post Options](#)

Thanks (0) [Thanks\(0\)](#) [Quote rami](#) [Quote](#) [Post Reply](#) [ReplyDirect](#) [Link To This Post](#)
Posted: 02 August 2007 at 8:16am

Bi ismillahir rahmanir raheem

You'll have to excuse my delay in replying to this i am having trouble reconciling one version of the theory of evolution with another. It seems the newer version has been dumbed down some what and interchanged with survival of the fittest philosophy which has nothing to do with the more radical understanding of evolution such as dogs or cats growing wings from thin air or even challenging Gods existence.

The new version or understanding of evolution is in no position to challenge Gods existence as they completely explain it away as a force within creation completely contrast to what it used to be.

at least that is the wiki version, i dont think much of wiki as you may already know.

Rasul Allah (sallah Ilahu alaihi wa sallam) said: "Whoever knows himself, knows his Lord" and whoever knows his Lord has been given His gnosis and nearness.

[Back to Top](#)

[Sawtul Khilafah View Drop Down](#)

Senior Member

Senior Member

Avatar

Joined: 20 July 2006

Location: Peru

Status: Offline

Points: 623 [Post Options](#) [Post Options](#)

[Thanks \(0\)](#) [Thanks\(0\)](#) [Quote Sawtul Khilafah](#) [Quote](#) [Post Reply](#)[ReplyDirect](#) [Link To This Post](#) Posted: 02 August 2007 at 9:25am

Proving Evolution:

Billions of years ago there was a dessert fork which through mutation slowly evolved into a relish fork, then a salad fork, and then a dinner fork... and finally a carving fork.

A lot of skeptics (religious fundamentalists) say there is no proof that these evolved from one another and that they were most likely created/invented by people, but evolutionists believe the similarity between these forks proves that they evolved from one another, and to say that "Humans" invented them is "unscientific". Some have gone as far as saying that humans don't even exist since there is no proof that humans invented the forks

[Back to Top](#)

[Israfil View Drop Down](#)

Senior Member

Senior Member

Avatar

Joined: 08 September 2003

Status: Offline

Points: 3984 [Post Options](#) [Post Options](#)

[Thanks \(0\)](#) [Thanks\(0\)](#) [Quote Israfil](#) [Quote](#) [Post Reply](#) [ReplyDirect](#) [Link To This Post](#)
Posted: 03 August 2007 at 12:43am

Funny Piece Sawtul,

I really don't think you guys really understand evolution. I just explained to you the best way I can.

[Back to Top](#)

[rami View Drop Down](#)

Moderator Group

Moderator Group

Avatar

Male

Joined: 01 March 2000

Status: Offline

Points: 2549

Post Options Post Options

Thanks (0) Thanks(0) Quote rami Quote Post ReplyReplyDirect Link To This Post
Posted: 03 August 2007 at 10:24pm

Bi ismillahi rahmani raheem

i will insha allah post my reply to the scientific aspects of the theory at a later time.

Again, this question may be misleading as you state science can "only" prove observable things. Although I'm inclined to agree that science can prove observable facts I would have to add that science can, in addition to proof ,can come up with logical and theoretical propositions that are true.

Theoretical propositions are not the realm of facts unless thoroughly proven by actual observation they are up for interpretation and reinterpretation, we are not dealing with the facts of the moment or even century but absolute facts.

The evolutionist argument against God is solely based on the point that God is not Physically Observable, it is only reasonable we apply the same standards to them otherwise they would be even more deserving of ridicule for lack of scholarly standards.

You have to understand that evolutionary thought has existed for centuries starting with the Greek Philosophers (and Roman thinkers) to Arab biologist such as Al-Jahiz.

Amr bin Bahr al-Fukaymi al-Basri was a Mutazilli, a heretical sect in Islam who's Aqeedah was on shaky ground. There are a number of concepts in evolution which are outright kufr Natural selection being the main one, it would not surprise me if it was in the end simply a Mutazili invention [or confusion as this group was known for attributing things to other than God but not to the extent of kufr] because clearly all observations they could have made at the time were by naked eye or very basic microscopes if they even where around at the time. So now we have to question the basis for there theory and why it was picked up blindly later on.

From wiki http://wiki.cotch.net/index.php/History_of_evolution

800s Ad: The medieval Muslim scientist and philosopher Al-Jahiz first describes the struggle for existence which was similar to natural selection.

They could simply be attributing natural selection to him, since they are not versed in theology I doubt they could perceive the subtle differences in logic that would be found in any Muslims arguments.

1000s Ad: The Muslim scholar Ibn al-Haitham elaborates Al-Jahiz's theories and writes a book that explicitly argued for biological evolution (although not by natural selection).

1770: Baron d'Holbach one of the first atheists in the Western world publishes The System of Nature which contains early evolutionary concepts such as the idea that humans evolved over the course of time and that every living thing changes in response to its environment.

Here we have the hand of the atheist attributing creation to other than god prior to that many did not take this path and it is unclear if Amr bin Bahr al-Fukaymi al-Basri a mutazili also did. The Idea of Nature being the force behind change is a pagan one, over the years it seems the concept stayed the same, but the definition of nature to a pagan is vastly different than to an atheist. When modern man says nature is the force of change or evolution most people imply that some sort of process which can be scientifically observed is the agent of change how can this ever be an argument against God he created nature/environment/creation itself. It is an argument when an Atheist declares it a force of change in the absolute sense without possible evidence but as an atheist ideology. The evolutionist in Question Stops talking about science and begins talking about theology, so then nature or natural selection to them becomes a force other than God, Have they Observed a force other than God at work in creation?

They chalange the existance of God by saying things like man evolved from an ape, Have they proven this by clear observation or simply concluded on observale facts,

""If evolution is not scientific, then what is it? It seems to me that it is a human interpretation, an endeavor, an industry, a literature, based on what the American philosopher Charles Peirce called abductive reasoning, which functions in the following way:

(1) Suprising fact A.

(2) If theory B were the case, then A would naturally follow.

(3) Therefore B.

Here, (1) alone is certain, (2) is merely probable (as it explains the facts, though does not preclude other possible theories), while (3) has only the same probability as (2). If you want to see how ironclad the case for the evolution of man is, make a list of all the fossils discovered so far that "prove" the evolution of man from lower life forms, date them, and then ask yourself if abductive reasoning is not what urges it, and if it really precludes the possibility of quite a different (2) in place of the theory of evolution.""

taken from <http://www.masud.co.uk/ISLAM/nuh/evolve.htm>

1838: Charles Darwin formulates the theory of natural selection.

If it was all a theory and un provable by modern scientific standards, I have to ask at this point are scientist simply attributing observable facts to evolution and thus ultimately natural selection by way of mental conditioning i.e the same way natural disasters are automatically attributed to God as punishment?

Because it is very clear the theory was not the product of modern scientific research, they went out to prove an ancient theory not concluded upon it by scholarly observation as the only possible explanation.

Have they proven there case beyond the shadow of a doubt.?

The line between natural selection and simple ♦survival of the fittest♦ are so blurred in peoples minds today I fail to see a difference almost. Take for example this wiki description of so called natural selection it has basically been reduced to survival of the fittest without them seeming to realize it.

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Natural_selection

I remember clearly when I was taught evolution at school that natural selection was a more radical agent capable of giving mammals wings without explanation i.e a real force of change not this blurring of concepts that we see.

I also have to point out two separate theories here Evolution by way of natural selection in the Atheist and pagan sense and Evolution by way of God. Looking at the phrasing of the classical statement "Evolution by way of natural selection" the term "By way" clearly denotes an attributing of the power of creation to a new force other than God, natural selection, as they intend the term. More clearly my point is they had to make an issue of who this evolutionary process was attributed to rather than simply state as a matter of science one species evolved from another.

we now have to go back to the claim of not being able to prove the existence of God and ask how can they then scientifically prove who evolution is attributed to, natural selection is a force and thus not physical in any sense.

Earlier I said the **why** of it is not in the scientist's hands, but this is "why" in the larger sense not why a DNA strand evolved to something else a purely scientific question whos answer lies in observation and thus science is not the realm of theology but the way in which creation works.

Many people confuse these two points, one group of people are arguing that God created something another is saying no it evolved, while thinking in there minds because it evolved god did not create it because god and science have nothing to do with each other, a product of modern rejection of the Christian faith and all the strings attached to that.

It is ironic that modern science by scientifically proving the process of evolution will defunct the atheist and pagan theories [or rather the way in which they intend the use of the terms nature] of evolution and prove it a work of God.

I will point out here that i am not necessarily agreeing that evolution exists, they have not proven it scientifically in my mind by any similar standard they have used to supposedly disprove the existence of God. Islamicly speaking evolution is a possibility but it still is only a theory.

Edited by rami

Rasul Allah (sallah Ilahu alaihi wa sallam) said: "Whoever knows himself, knows his Lord" and whoever knows his Lord has been given His gnosis and nearness.

[Back to Top](#)

[Israfil View Drop Down](#)

Senior Member

Senior Member

Avatar

Joined: 08 September 2003

Status: Offline

Points: 3984 [Post Options](#) [Post Options](#)

Thanks (0) Thanks(0) [Quote Israfil](#) [Quote](#) [Post Reply](#) [ReplyDirect](#) [Link To This Post](#)
Posted: 05 August 2007 at 12:46am

Rami its obvious that although I have shown the position of evolution logical basis in science you will not at least in part understand what I'm saying. So with this in mind I'll simply explain why Creationism shouldn't be taught in school.

Proposition #1

Creationism is not universal

First off, Creationism pressuposes that the Earth was created by God. Although majority of human beings on earth has some sort of spiritual foundation, this belief is not equally applicable to all humans. In addition, spirituality much like aesthetics, must be obtained through an experience that is unique to the individual. This quality is not always experienced by everyone.

Creationism cannot be proven

The strength of Creationism comes from its foundation which is mainly doctrinal. Even if, somehow Creationism can prove that an intelligent artisan designed the world how can they prove it is not some super intelligent extra-terrestrial and not God? So in addition to proving God even designed the Earth another obstacle would be to prove if

God is not some super intelligent alien with the capabilities of creating planets and intelligent organisms within them.

Creationism comes from Christianity

Creationism origins comes from Christian thought not Islamic so even if Muslims agree I don't see why they support it since Creationism (as far as general consensus is concerned) is Christian thought. Of course, the more universal approach here would be to change the language and say designer but even then this designer would succumb to the scrutiny of what kind of designer this is. Is this designer the one who has given the book to prophets or simply a Demiurge? Even if this designer is the former it is obvious that there would be some disagreement here. If the designer is the latter then there is obvious disagreement because his designer is not simply an entity with infinite quality but finite qualities as well.

Creationism is a spiritual belief which is personal

The belief in God is personal because the ultimate goal for religioonist is to obtain a close relationship with God. Although an open relationship is encouraged, it is generally thought that people (at least in Islamic ideology) shouldn't be compelled to know religion. Teaching Creationism in class is a direct slap in the face to those who are agnostic, atheist or of another religious faith. If we must offer Creationism this respect we must offer other religious interpretations to science as well.

Taking natural selection out of the picture for one second I dont see how evolution is not believed in. All organisms evolve. Our ancestors evolved from the African climate to other climates to different parts of Europe and Asia. This is why human beings in different parts of the world have different skin tone. This is evolution.

[Back to Top](#)

[Israfil View Drop Down](#)

Senior Member

Senior Member

Avatar

Joined: 08 September 2003

Status: Offline

Points: 3984 Post Options Post Options

Thanks (0) Thanks(0) Quote Israfil Quote Post ReplyReplyDirect Link To This Post
Posted: 21 September 2007 at 1:17am

Why Evolution is supported

My reasons

1) All humans have shared genes, however, all of our genes are hereditary from our parents, eye color, hair color, skin tone etc. Our genetic makeup is the result of earlier adaptation in various environments. Evolution occurs when these heritable differences become more common or rare in a population, either non-randomly through natural selection or randomly through genetic drift.

2) Phenotype is the result of the interaction of the genotype in their environment. Genetic variation happens through the fluctuation of one particular allele which may or may not become prevalent in other forms of that gene. What does this mean? Evolution forces these alleles to shift in one direction or another. This partial explanation shows the driving force of Evolution on a cellular level. Of course there are several processes that could be explained however I wanted to note what I found very important as one of the driving forces of cellular evolution.

3) Natural selection is a necessary component to the survival of certain organisms. A simple example would be the environmental changes. Most individuals with dark skin complexion are more suitable for hot environments versus those whose skin has a lighter pigmentation. Individuals with lighter skin complexion living in hot climates normally do not last long and eventually would develop skin cancer and die off. Every individual may not succumb to such a fate but a lot would and those that survived may produce offspring some tens of thousands of years later with slightly darker skin complexion.

Central Argument why Creationism doesn't fit

What's interesting here is Creationism is not necessarily criticized for its central belief in God, but because of its story of Noah's Ark. The Ark has an estimated size of a football field in which God has given Noah for him and his family and 2 of every animal

on earth. Now mind you, scientist have discovered 12,000 new species! this does not mention species which existed 5,000 years ago. Now given the Ark's size how is it possible to fit 2 of perhaps over 12,0000 species in one boat the size of a football field? God who is the author of all things does not make any errors but perhaps the story in accordance to Biblical standards may be slightly off?

Even if we were suppose that all these species were able to fit on the boat what about after the flood?

[Back to Top](#)

[Andalus View Drop Down](#)

Moderator Group

Moderator Group

Joined: 12 October 2005

Location: United States

Status: Offline

Points: 1187 [Post Options](#) [Post Options](#)

Thanks (0) [Thanks\(0\)](#) [Quote Andalus](#) [Quote](#) [Post Reply](#)[ReplyDirect](#) [Link To This Post](#)
Posted: 27 September 2007 at 9:22pm

Assalam Aleikum Br.

I have been wanting to add my comments for some time but the month and mounting responsibilities have placed a damper on my time and energy to participate in such "deep" topics. It is at this piont that we vehemently disagree. First, let us put forth in a basic and cursory manner, an underlying principle of evolution. That life began as nothing more than organic molecules floating around in some goo that came together in just a right way that gave rise to some kind of basic "replicator" (a term often used by Richard Dawkins) which could replicate copy of itself, and through successive mutation in response to the environment, we get single cell life, and this also evolves through successive mutations and beomce more complex, on and on and on, until we have mammals, and reptiles, and insects, etc, etc, etc.

The idea that a lifeform can, as a species, adapt and survive the onset of environmental changes is a point brought up by evolutionists, and their supporters. The problem is that a species adapting to change does not imply, at all, on any level, that

1) life started in some goo of organic compounds

2) that speciation occurred (something becoming a reptile and a mammal for instance)

In other words, because an elephant, isolated on a island over time becomes small, does not imply, that 1 or 2 are true, which is at the heart of evolution.

There is not a single shred of evidence that strongly supports one and two. They have tampered and tweaked the definition of "speciation" so that one could include fruit flies that have hair growth that another group of fruit flies does not have as two different species. Smoking mirrors!

Originally posted by Israfil Israfil wrote:

Why Evolution is supported

My reasons

1) All humans have shared genes, however, all of our genes are hereditary from our parents, eye color, hair color, skin tone etc. Our genetic makeup is the result of earlier

adaptation in various environments. Evolution occurs when these heritable differences become more common or rare in a population, either non-randomly through natural selection or randomly through genetic drift.

There is no evidence to show that random mutations have created us as a distinct species. That is speculation. Your claim does try and fit into the extremely loose use of the concept of "mutation giving rise to speciation".

The evolutionist must prove that mutations started life, and that life grew into some other species.

Quote

2) Phenotype is the result of the interaction of the genotype in their environment. Genetic variation happens through the fluctuation of one particular allele which may or may not become prevalent in other forms of that gene. What does this mean? Evolution forces these alleles to shift in one direction or another. This partial explanation shows the driving force of Evolution on a cellular level. Of course there are several processes that could be explained however I wanted to note what I found very important as one of the driving forces of cellular evolution.

evolution fails to explain the very basics of "cellular" evolution because it fails to show just how complicated systems came into being. As an example, the blood clotting system. The blood clotting system must have two essential components: clotting at the right time and place. If not, the system will die. It is that simple. The blood clotting system is extremely complicated, and it is also in the most simplistic form (you cannot take away or add to it). To use the idea of cellular evolution would only show the extreme weakness of the theory and the reason why evolution is a "dead end". If you say that the blood clotting system came into being through random mutations, then you must show how the system worked with only a one or two or a few basic elements. Of course this would be impossible given that nothing can be taken away or added without destroying the system thus killing the organism. The system is "irreducible". The chances that the system "just" came into being from some huge random dice roll is impossible.

Quote

3) Natural selection is a necessary component to the survival of certain organisms. A simple example would be the environmental changes. Most individuals with dark skin complexion are more suitable for hot environments versus those whose skin has a lighter pigmentation. Individuals with lighter skin complexion living in hot climates normally do not last long and eventually would develop skin cancer and die off. Every individual may not succumb to such a fate but a lot would and those that survived may produce offspring some tens of thousands of years later with slightly darker skin complexion.

Once more, none of this supports that founding ideas of evolution. I have personally heard supporters and scientists state that macro changes (adaptation) automatically gives "micro" (different species forming, life from nothing, etc). This is a fallacy.

This is all I have time for Br.

I hope you are having a blessed month.

A feeling of discouragement when you slip up is a sure sign that you put your faith in deeds. -Ibn 'Ata'llah

<http://www.sunnipath.com>

<http://www.sunniforum.com/forum/>

<http://www.pt-go.com/>